

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY 2120

MINUTES OF THE NORTHERN CELL ASSESSMENT PANEL WORKSHOP 9 HELD AT THE HB REGIONAL COUNCIL, DALTON ST, NAPIER, COMMENCING AT 5.00 P.M. TUESDAY 5 SEPTEMBER 2017

PRESENT

Panel Members:

Craig Daly, Garry Huata, Steve Loughlin, Mike Penrose, Dorothy Pilkington, Oliver Postings, Martin Rockel, Hoani Taurima, Shaun Thompson-Gray, Tim Tinker, Michel de Vos.

Facilitation Team:

Peter Beaven (Chair), Simon Bendall, Stephen Daysh, Aramanu Ropiha (Kaitiaki o te Roopu), Jan Seaman (Minutes).

Observers:

Mark Clews, Larry Dallimore, Craig Goodier, Graeme Hansen, Tania Huata, Trudy Kilkolly, James Minehan.

Technical Advisors:

Mike Allis (NIWA), Jonathan Clarke (T & T).

APOLOGIES

Paul Bailey, Mark Levick, Sarah Owen, Douglas Dickson, Emma Ryan.

Motion

That the apologies be accepted.

The motion was moved (Craig Daly), seconded (Tim Tinker) and confirmed.

WELCOME AND KARAKIA

The Chairman extended a welcome to attendees.

Aramanu Ropiha opened the meeting with a karakia.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes of Workshop 8 held on 15 August 2017 at the Napier Sailing Club were circulated.

Motion

That the Minutes of Workshop 8 be confirmed as a true and correct record with one change:

Pg 4 Other Recommendations – Point 2. The second sentence to be removed (*The panel supported.....*).

The motion was moved (Shaun Thompson-Gray), seconded (Mike Penrose) and carried.

Matters Arising/Actions

Dorothy Pilkington commented that her remark in Workshop 6 suggesting it would be beneficial to have a member of the Tourism Board on the panel was in relation to all recreational beach users and not just surfers.

REVIEW RECOMMENDED TECHNICAL CRITERIA SCORING

1. The panel worked through and confirmed/changed technical scores which had been recommended by the technical panel.
2. “A” and “B” scores had been noted for some pathways where ‘Renourishment and Control Structures’ featured – it was noted that in the Southern Panel it was agreed that in all cases ‘control structures’ would refer to groynes, where in the Northern Panel context panel members wished to leave on the table for consideration the options of offshore reefs and breakwaters (which are also ‘control structures’). For the purposes of scoring, it was felt by the technical panel that groynes and offshore structures may score differently, so where it was considered necessary both were scored with “A” being groyne and “B” an offshore reef/ breakwater.
3. Mana Whenua representatives had also met separately, with the support of Aramanu Ropiha, to discuss and develop recommended scores for the cultural criteria.
4. Simon noted any additions/alterations directly on the document and the following comments were noted.

Ahuriri

1. Pathway 3 – technically no difference in effectiveness “A” and “B” structures so scoring the same for groyne or offshore reef.
2. Pathway 4 – same comments apply as for Pathway 3.
3. Pathway 5 – question relating to wording around the “two businesses” and whether this would still be relevant over a 100-year period. Simon made changes to the wording.
4. Pathway 6 – Sea walls and adaptability queried. There is a structure already in place and as this is less adaptable everything was scored a 3.

Pandora

1. Advised the “0” for all pathways under the heading “Manages the Risk for Coastal Erosion” reflects the fact there is no erosion risk for this unit.
2. Pathway 4 – queried the score of “5” for inundation for pathway 3 and only “4” for pathway 4 which featured a floodgate. Advised that it was considered that a score of 4 was appropriate to account for potential mechanical failure of the flood gate. The panel felt there would be an engineering risk to both stop banks and floodgates and agreed they should both have a score of “5”.
3. A score of “2” was queried for environmental impacts. The floodgate would only be used when required and the amount of water from a storm/tidal surge would exceed that of rain. The panel was divided on whether the score should be a “2” or “3” so there was a show of hands, with “3” winning the vote.
4. Cultural criteria scoring was low on a precautionary basis as it was felt any structure built to house a flood gate may narrow the channel and therefore have an impact on fish and waka access. Confirmed this would depend on design (there may need to be multiple gates) and how long the floodgate would be closed. Agreed to leave the scoring at “2” on a precautionary basis.

Westshore

1. Clarification sought Pathway 1 – panel shown the location of Rangatira Reef.
2. Pathway 3 – clarification sought on pathways for Westshore in relation to sand bank issues and why there was not an option for Renourishment all the way through to the long term. Pathway 3 concedes control structures would need to be put in at some stage when climate change causes sediment losses that exceed the capacity to renourish – it may not be possible to get large enough quantities of sand replenishment as quickly as required and the cost may become prohibitive. However it may

also be that renourishment could continue to be effective such that control structures are not needed. In this scenario the medium term response of nourishment could last beyond the medium term. The pathways allow flexibility to respond to either scenario. Agreed this should remain a “3”.

3. Pathway 4 – Poor score for Relationship with Maori principally because of the sea wall at the end.
4. Pathway 6 – Socio impact benefits relate to amenity aspects. Asset value of houses to be taken into account at the next workshop. When costs were available pathways would be finalised.

The meeting broke at 6.35 p.m. and resumed at 6.50 p.m.

Garry Huata and Martin Rockel left the meeting.

5. Mike Penrose questioned the process and whether the categories and weightings would result in the best answers for what may happen at the end of the 100-year period, given there is nothing considered past that time. Advised structures erected could provide ongoing benefit and reviews would be carried out every ten years, which would result in progressive planning over time.
6. Simon advised the following:
 - a. The assessment was incomplete at this time as cost had not yet been factored in;
 - b. a “stand back” test would be done as part of the sensitivity analysis;
 - c. When the final report was done on behalf of the panel it would record all steps, process decisions and agreements. The panel could then review and ensure it reflected the process undertaken.

Bay View

1. No further discussion on the six pathways. Question what “SLR” means – refers to “sea level rise”.

Whirinaki

1. Pathway 4. Questioned the score for Risk Transfer, which was lower in Bay View than Whirinaki. Explanation was added to the scoring sheet.
2. Pathway 6. Questioned the score of “4” for managing risks for storm surge. Pathway 4 includes renourishment – Simon added an explanation to the scoring sheet. Discussion on whether increased risk from inundation in Pathway 6 should change score and agreed this should be increased to a “5”. Natural Environment Impacts scored a “2”, however there may be some positive impacts on wildlife. Comments were added to the sea wall options.

“A” and “B” Clarification

1. Ahuriri Pathway 3. “A” = groyne; “B” – offshore reef/breakwater.
2. The technical scoring group thought there may be some differences between the scores for structures considered as ‘control structures’. The panel was asked if they agreed that a groyne could score differently to an offshore reef/breakwater and whether the offshore reef option should be retained. Differences between the structures in relation to the environment were questioned. Jonathan advised the biggest difference would be that one is built on the sea bed, which could potentially change the environment. With groynes the beach would be limited to just beyond the extent of the proposed groynes. There could be a smaller affect in terms of currents. A submerged breakwater may provide more of a rocky habitat than a groyne.
3. The panel discussed whether or not the offshore reef option should be retained. Agreed it should be retained in the meantime, with a decision being made in the future as to which would be best.
4. Confirmed the only place where an (underwater) offshore reef was considered was Ahuriri but the breakwater would remain on the table elsewhere.

Action: *The number “15” to be added in Ahuriri Pathway 4 under Control Structures.*

Action: *The definition of keys on the tables needs clarification – “A” and “B” mean different things in different tables. Simon to follow-up.*

NEXT STEPS

1. The Chairman advised pathways would be costed and a consultant would be engaged to assist with the costings and development of public-private split of costs. A workshop would be held with Councilors from all three councils, where they would consider a set of numbers. The consultants would then complete the analysis. The information, including principles and costings, would be presented to the panel at the next workshop.
2. A public consultation meeting would then be held to get feedback prior to recommendations being finalised. The triggers for change would also need to be considered.

Action: *Requested that the panel receive costings as soon as possible.*

3. The Chairman talked about the public-private split of costs, with the public being the balance of the ratepayer community. It was yet to be determined whether there would be a split between the immediate coastal community and the balance of the Heretaunga Plains area, or perhaps a three-way split. There was a parallel with the flood scheme ratings, where there were classifications based on level of benefit received and something could be done along those lines for the coastal area. Further discussions would need to be held around a range of classifications and apportionment of costs, however, it was up to the panel to determine the pathways.
4. Suggested it might be beneficial to see the Southern Cell costings to get some idea of the costs for the whole community, however, it was felt there might not be anything to be gained by comparing the pathway costings between the two cells. As the strategy would be over a 100-year time period not everything would need to be undertaken at the same time.

EDGE EVALUATION SHEET

1. Evaluation sheets were handed out for completion at the meeting, or online.

NEXT MEETING

1. The next meeting will be held on 17 October 2017.
2. Aramanu Ropiha closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 7.40 p.m.

AGREED ACTIONS:

Task	Meeting / Agenda Item	Actions	Resp.	Status/Comment
1.	Workshop 6, DE-BRIEF AND FEEDBACK FROM 6 JUNE COMMUNITY MEETING	Peter to circulate the presentation by the Port of Napier to the panel.	Peter Beaven	Port of Napier Consent Application not yet submitted. This should be done within 3 – 4 weeks.
2.	Workshop 7, T&T AND EDGE PRESENTATION	Jonathan Clarke to put together some examples where an offshore reef has been successful, with information being circulated to the panel.	Jon Clarke	Completed.
3.	Workshop 7, T&T AND EDGE PRESENTATION	Recommendation be drawn up to highlight the need for better commonality between interpretation of the Building Code and the provisions of the District Plan / Regional Coastal Plan.	TAG	Recommendation to be added to Assessment Panel report.
4.	Workshop 8, SCORING OF CRITERIA – Cultural Values	Schedule a further workshop to score the cultural criteria for Westshore.	Monique	Completed.
5.	Workshop 8, SCORING OF CRITERIA	Circulate the scoring sheet to the panels once the Westshore cultural criteria has been completed.	Monique	Completed.
6.	Workshop 8, WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS	Confirmation email including options for the final meeting date to be circulated to the panel.	Monique	Completed.
7.	Workshop 8, WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS	Schedule a workshop for both Northern and Southern panels on triggers.	TAG / Judy	Workshop for both panels on triggers – Jonathan doing work in this area, which will be important when the pathways have been chosen. This will form part of the implementation stage (Stage 4), however, feedback from panel members would be helpful. Agreed to leave as an Action point. Action: TAG to come back at the next workshop with information on how to best address this issue.
8.	Workshop 9, REVIEW RECOMMENDED TECHNICAL CRITERIA SCORING, “A” and “B” Clarification	The number “15” to be added in Ahuriri Pathway 4 under Control Structures.	Simon	
9.	Workshop 9, REVIEW RECOMMENDED TECHNICAL CRITERIA SCORING, “A” and “B” Clarification	The definition of keys on the tables needs clarification – “A” and “B” mean different things in different tables.	Simon	
10.	Workshop 9, NEXT STEPS	Circulate the costing information to the panel as soon as possible.	TAG	To be discussed at workshop 10.